

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1609

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION			
Requestor Name and Address:	MFDR Tracking#: M4-08-7179-01		
TEXAS ORTHOPEDIC HOSPITAL 3701 KIRBY DRIVE SUITE 1288	DWC Claim #:		
HOUSTON TX 77098-3926	Injured Employee:		
Respondent Name and Box #:	Date of Injury:		
TEXAS MUTUAL INSURANCE CO Box #: 54	Employer Name:		
	Insurance Carrier #:		

PART II: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary: "Per Rule § 134.401(c)(6)(A)(i)(iii), once the bill has reached the minimum stop-loss threshold of \$40K, the entire admission will be paid using the stop-loss reimbursement factor ('SLRF') of 75%." "Therefore, the fees paid by the Carrier in this case do not conform to the reimbursement section of Rule § 134.401 and are in blatant contradiction with the findings of SOAH's En Banc Panel and the Travis County District Court.

Amount in Dispute: \$28,887.08

PART III: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary: "...the admission did not have services that were unusually extensive or unusually costly and total audited charges do not exceed the minimum threshold of \$40,000. Payment under the stop-loss exception has not been justified by the hospital in this case, and Texas Mutual's payment under the per diem plus carve-outs method is appropriate."

PART IV: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Date(s) of Service	Denial Code(s)	Disputed Service	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
8/2/2007 through 8/6/2007	CAC-W10, CAC-97, 217, 426, 719, CAC-W4, CAC-143, 420	Inpatient Hospitalization	\$28,887.08	\$0.00
			Total Due:	\$0.00

PART V: REVIEW OF SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY AND EXPLANATION

Texas Labor Code § 413.011(a-d), titled Reimbursement Policies and Guidelines, and Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, titled *Medical Reimbursement*, effective May 2, 2006 set out the reimbursement guidelines.

This request for medical fee dispute resolution was received by the Division on August 1, 2008.

- 1. For the services involved in this dispute, the respondent reduced or denied payment with reason codes:
 - CAC-W10-No maximum allowable defined by fee guideline. Reimbursement made based on insurance carrier fair and reasonable reimbursement methodology.
 - CAC-97-Payment is included in the allowance for another service/procedure.
 - 217-The value of this procedure is included in the value of another procedure performed on this date.
 - 426-Reimbursed to fair and reasonable.
 - 719-Reimbursed at carrier's fair & reasonable; cost data unavailable for facility. Additional payment may be considered if data submitted.
 - Billed charges do not meet the stop-loss payment standard. The intent of stop-loss payment is to compensate hospitals for inpatient stays that are eithr costly to the facility by an unusually long length of stay or the provision of unusually costly types of services. The provision of implantables through the facility does not fit either of these

situations. [sic]

- CAC-W4-No additional reimbursement allowed after review of appeal/reconsideration.
- CAC-143-Portion of payment deferred.
- · 420-Supplemental payment.
- 2. This dispute relates to inpatient surgical services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.401(c)(5)(A), effective August 1, 1997, 22 TexReg 6264, which requires that when "Trauma (ICD-9 codes 800.0-959.50)" diagnosis codes are listed as the primary diagnosis, reimbursement for the entire admission shall be at a fair and reasonable rate. Review of box 67 on the hospital bill finds that the principle diagnosis code is listed as 823.20. The Division therefore determines that this inpatient admission shall be reimbursed at a fair and reasonable rate pursuant to Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1 and Texas Labor Code §413.011(d).
- 3. The requestor asks for reimbursement under the stop loss provision of the Division's *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline* found in Division rule at 28 TAC §134.401(c)(6). The requestor asserts in the position statement that "Per Rule § 134.401(c)(6)(A)(i)(iii), once the bill has reached the minimum stop-loss threshold of \$40K, the entire admission will be paid using the stop-loss reimbursement factor ('SLRF') of 75%." "Therefore, the fees paid by the Carrier in this case do not conform to the reimbursement section of Rule § 134.401 and are in blatant contradiction with the findings of SOAH's En Banc Panel and the Travis County District Court." Division rule at 28 TAC §134.401(c)(6), effective August 1, 1997, 22 TexReg 6264, states, in part, that "The diagnosis codes specified in paragraph (5) of this subsection are exempt from the stop-loss methodology and the entire admission shall be reimbursed at a fair and reasonable rate." As stated above, the Division has found that the primary diagnosis is a code specified in Division rule at 28 TAC §134.401(c)(5); therefore, the disputed services are exempt from the stop-loss methodology and the entire admission shall be reimbursed at a fair and reasonable rate pursuant to Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1.
- 4. Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1, effective May 2, 2006, 31 TexReg 3561, requires that, in the absence of an applicable fee guideline, reimbursement for health care not provided through a workers' compensation health care network shall be made in accordance with subsection §134.1(d) which states that "Fair and reasonable reimbursement: (1) is consistent with the criteria of Labor Code §413.011; (2) ensures that similar procedures provided in similar circumstances receive similar reimbursement; and (3) is based on nationally recognized published studies, published Division medical dispute decisions, and values assigned for services involving similar work and resource commitments, if available."
- 5. Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) requires that fee guidelines must be fair and reasonable and designed to ensure the quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control. The guidelines may not provide for payment of a fee in excess of the fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living and paid by that individual or by someone acting on that individual's behalf. It further requires that the Division consider the increased security of payment afforded by the Act in establishing the fee guidelines.
- 6. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(C), effective May 25, 2008, 33 TexReg 3954, applicable to requests filed on or after May 25, 2008, requires that the request shall include "the form DWC-60 table listing the specific disputed health care and charges in the form and manner prescribed by the Division." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor has listed the disputed dates of service on the *Table of Disputed Services* as 08/02/2008 through 08/06/2007. A review of the submitted hospital bill indicates that the hospital admission was from 08/02/2007 through 08/06/2007. The requestor has therefore failed to complete the required sections of the request in the form and manner prescribed under Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(C).
- 7. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(E), effective May 25, 2008, 33 TexReg 3954, applicable to requests filed on or after May 25, 2008, requires that the request shall include "a copy of all applicable medical records specific to the dates of service in dispute." Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not provided medical records to support the services in dispute. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(E).
- 8. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iv), effective May 25, 2008, 33 TexReg 3954, applicable to requests filed on or after May 25, 2008, requires that the request shall include "a position statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include"... "how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor has not discussed how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iv).
- 9. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(G), effective May 25, 2008, 33 TexReg 3954, applicable to requests filed on or after May 25, 2008, requires the requestor to provide "documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement in accordance with §134.1 of this title (relating to Medical Reimbursement) when the dispute involves health care for which the Division has not established a maximum allowable reimbursement (MAR), as applicable." Review of the submitted documentation finds that:
 - The requestor's position statement states that "Per Rule § 134.401(c)(6)(A)(i)(iii), once the bill has reached the

minimum stop-loss threshold of \$40K, the entire admission will be paid using the stop-loss reimbursement factor ('SLRF') of 75%." "Therefore, the fees paid by the Carrier in this case do not conform to the reimbursement section of Rule § 134.401 and are in blatant contradiction with the findings of SOAH's En Banc Panel and the Travis County District Court"

- The requestor seeks reimbursement for this admission based upon the stop-loss reimbursement methodology which
 is not applicable per Division rule at 28 TAC §134.401(c)(6).
- The requestor does not discuss or explain how payment of 75% of charges would result in a fair and reasonable reimbursement.
- The requestor did not submit documentation to support that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement.
- The Division has previously found that a reimbursement methodology based upon payment of a hospital's billed charges, or a percentage of billed charges, does not produce an acceptable payment amount. This methodology was considered and rejected by the Division in the *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline* adoption preamble which states at 22 Texas Register 6276 (July 4, 1997) that:

"A discount from billed charges was another method of reimbursement which was considered. Again, this method was found unacceptable because it leaves the ultimate reimbursement in the control of the hospital, thus defeating the statutory objective of effective cost control and the statutory standard not to pay more than for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living. It also provides no incentive to contain medical costs, would be administratively burdensome for the Commission and system participants, and would require additional Commission resources."

- The requestor does not discuss or explain how payment of the requested amount would satisfy the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1.
- The requestor did not discuss or support that the proposed methodology would ensure that similar procedures provided in similar circumstances receive similar reimbursement.
- The requestor did not submit nationally recognized published studies, published Division medical dispute decisions, or documentation of values assigned for services involving similar work and resource commitments to support the proposed methodology.

The request for additional reimbursement is not supported. Thorough review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not demonstrated or justified that payment of the amount sought would be a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in dispute. Additional payment cannot be recommended.

10. The Division would like to emphasize that individual medical fee dispute outcomes rely upon the evidence presented by the requestor and respondent during dispute resolution, and the thorough review and consideration of that evidence. After thorough review and consideration of all the evidence presented by the parties to this dispute, it is determined that the submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The Division concludes that this dispute was not filed in the form and manner prescribed under Division rules at 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(c)(2)(C), §133.307(c)(2)(E), §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iv) and §133.307(c)(2)(G). The Division further concludes that the requestor failed to support its position that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$0.00.

PART VI: GENERAL PAYMENT POLICIES/REFERENCES

Texas Labor Code §413.011(a-d), §413.031 and §413.0311 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307, §134.1, §134.401 Texas Government Code, Chapter 2001, Subchapter G

PART VII: DIVISION DECISION

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the requestor is not entitled to additional reimbursement for the services involved in this dispute.

DECISION:		
Authorized Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	10/28/10 Date
Authorized Signature	Health Care Business Management Director	10/28/10 Date

PART VIII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST AN APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute has a right to request an appeal. A request for hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **20** (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. **Please include a copy of the Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision** together with other required information specified in Division rule at 28 TAC §148.3(c).

Under Texas Labor Code §413.0311, your appeal will be handled by a Division hearing under Title 28 Texas Administrative Code Chapter 142 Rules if the total amount sought does not exceed \$2,000. If the total amount sought exceeds \$2,000, a hearing will be conducted by the State Office of Administrative Hearings under Texas Labor Code §413.031.

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.